

THE BULGARIAN CHARACTER^{an} OF EASTERN THRACE

FACTS, STATISTICAL DATA AND TESTIMONIES
OF FOREIGN TRAVELLERS AND SCHOLARS

SUBMITTED BY THE HIGH COMMITTEE FOR EASTERN THRACE

SOFIA — 1919



I.

By Eastern Thrace we designate that part of the vilayet of Adrianople which remained under Turkish rule in 1913. It is the territory lying between the present Turco-Bulgarian frontier, the Black Sea, the peninsula of Constantinople, the Sea of Marmora and the Aegean Sea.

For centuries this country has been inhabited by Bulgarians who constitute the principal agricultural element of this fertile province. The Greeks are disseminated here and there in the towns and along the littoral where they form the mercantile element. As for the Turks, they have been artificially planted in the country by the authorities with the object of clearing the hinterland of the capital of the Bulgarian element whose masses, down to 1912, reached to the very gates of Constantinople.

Our ancient kings have repeatedly ruled Adrianople and the rest of the country down to Constantinople. In 813 Tsar Krum took Adrianople and pushed the Bulgarian frontier to the river Erghene. In the reign of Tsar Simeon (892—927) the Bulgarian boundary reached the Sea of Marmora, while in the time of Tsar Ivan Asen II. (1218—1240) the eastern boundary of Bulgaria was formed by the Enos—Midia line.

But it is not this *domination*, of shorter or longer duration, which forms the basis of our national rights to this country. There is something more elevated, more modern, that is to say, more in agreement with the spirit of our times. It is, namely, *the principle of nationality*.

The Bulgaria of San Stefano, in 1878, comprised the territories of Eastern Thrace beyond Lule Burgas, but Adrianople was left to the Turks, as Russia reserved this town for herself, considering it as forming an integral part of the hinterland of Constantinople.

The celebrated geographer, **H. Kiepert**, in one of his works written after the conclusion of the San Stefano Treaty, expresses astonishment at the readiness of the Turks to make such a concession — allowing the Bulgarian boundary to intercept the railway line running between Adrianople and Constantinople in the neighbourhood of Lule Burgas. He explains it only with the fact that *that part of Eastern Thrace was thickly populated by Bulgarians*. At the Berlin Congress this part of the Bulgarian fatherland was handed back to the Turks. In patriotism and

in spiritual culture, however, the Bulgarian population of Eastern Thrace did not remain far behind that of liberated Bulgaria. Until 1913 Eastern Thrace possessed a large number of Bulgarian schools, supported exclusively by the native Bulgarian population. In the diocese of Adrianople alone (there are eight dioceses in the vilayet of Adrianople) there were (in 1900) 78 primary schools and six secondary schools — with 133 teachers and 4,396 pupils. The above schools were for the Orthodox Bulgarians, while there existed also several Catholic schools for the Catholic Bulgarians. Besides, the Bulgarian Catholics and Orthodox possessed between them three colleges.

The Bulgarians of Eastern Thrace have produced several generations of educated men, who completed their education at the university of Sofia, in Russia, and in other European countries. A number of the leaders in the spiritual and political life of Bulgaria to-day come from Eastern Thrace. The first Bulgarian exarch (who, later on, sat as president of the Constituent Assembly in Tirnovo), *Anthim I.*, was born in Lozengrad (Kirk Kilisse). The late *Right Rev. Parthenius*, bishop of Sofia and president of the holy Synod of the Bulgarian Church, also came from Eastern Thrace.

In the revolutionary movements which took place in 1841 and 1903, to throw off the Turkish yoke, the Bulgarians of Eastern Thrace took their fair share with those living in Macedonia and in the now liberated Bulgaria.

In latter years the Turkish government grew more and more nervous at the close neighbourhood of the Bulgarians to their capital and they did their best to strengthen the Turkish element and simultaneously to thin down the Bulgarians in Eastern Thrace. **H. Adalbert Daniel**¹⁾, **Gustav Adolf v. Kloeden**²⁾ and others state that, after the Crimean war, the Turks brought over (July, 1864) large masses of Circassians (Tcherkese), amounting in all to 595,000 souls, whom they established in their European provinces, 30,000 of whom were sent via Burgas into Eastern Thrace. After the Russo-Turkish war in 1878 the Turks brought over muhadjirs (colonists) from other parts of the empire and established them (about 70,000) in the vilayet of Adrianople. There are still living witnesses to this fact.

After the Russo-Turkish war, the Ottoman government created in an artificial manner *new Turkish villages* in the province of Adrianople (and farther on towards Constantinople) in order to denationalize this fine Bulgarian province. A certain number of villages have been formed in this way, such as the following villages in the district of *Tchataldja*: Mandra, Gumush Bunar, Karaman Dere, Halaatchia, Tchaushli, Bekirli, Alatin, Saitli, Tchair Dere, etc. In 1909 the Turkish government installed Turkish colonists (muhadjirs) in the village Ayvatli (*district of Tchataldja*) to crowd out the Bulgarian population in order to force it

¹⁾ Handbuch der Geographie, 4 Auflage, Leipzig 1875, p. 45.

²⁾ Handbuch der Länder- und Staatenkunde von Europa, Berlin 1877, Zweite Hälfte, p. 708.

to emigrate. Only two years before the *huriet* (declaration of the Turkish constitution), in 1906, the same tactics were employed with regard to the Bulgarian village of Tuzalak (*district of Tchataldja*). Turkish immigrants were distributed, but in small numbers, up to twenty families per locality, in various villages of the same district, among others in the villages of Kazaldjali, Anakash, Hisovren, Endjekeui, Sovus, Saribegli, Urmanli, Karadjakeui, Subashkeui, Kabaktcha, Indje, etc. The same thing was done earlier with the Bulgarian villages close to Constantinople: Tashil with about 200 Bulgarian houses, Kalus, 110 houses, Ermenkeui, 100 Bulgarian houses, Karioto, 100 houses, Guptcheli, 100 Bulgarian houses. The ancient Bulgarian village of Yapadja (*district of Silivria*), which until 1878 had less than ten Turkish houses, possessed over 100 in 1912.

From 1883 to 1898 the following *new Turkish villages* were formed by colonists in the district of *Tchorlu*: Kazil Bunar, Velimesh, Getcherler, Osmankeui, Karaamet, Kizil Agatch, Kapakli Bunar, Tulbe Dere, Manuk, Kutchuk Mandra, Kapakli, Bunartcha, Yanikagal and Bukhtcha Bunar.

In the district of *Viza* the villages: Develi, Biazkeui, Kumsait, Pazarli, etc.

In the district of *Lule Burgas* the villages: Avrensekiz, Domus Orman, Tcheshmekolu, Devetchata, Ivankeui, Uvatatarlar, Tashli, etc.

In the district of *Bunar Hissar* the villages: Puriali, Tuzakli, Mandritsa, Osmandjik, Kazankeui, Karandjik, Manastir Dere, Duandja and Bey Bunar (all peopled by Pomaks). The colonization of this district with immigrant Turks did not take place peacefully. There have been almost pitched battles between the old Bulgarian inhabitants of the villages and the new-comers. In the end the Bulgarians had to quit their homes and lands and take refuge in Bulgaria.

It is these villages that our officers looked for in vain (during the Balkan war in 1912) in the Russian map, drawn during the Russo-Turkish war in 1877/78.

In the district of *Lozengrad* (Kirk Kilisse), the new Turkish villages, sprung up after 1888, are: Armanli, Kilisse Bair, Tchairli, Kapaklu, Bairam Dere, Takhta Bair, Kuzutcharda, Karadjaolan, Tashavlu, Nadjak, Mundardja, Kazildjik Dere, Kavak Dere, etc.

The above enumeration of newly-created Turkish villages refers to only a few districts of Eastern Thrace; it is not exhaustive.

If we bear in mind this artificial peopling of Eastern Thrace with Turks and take it in conjunction with what was done after the Crimean war and after the Russo-Turkish war, we shall be in a position to understand why **A. de Lamartine**, who travelled in 1832 from Constantinople to Adrianople and thence to Sofia and Nish, speaks of Eastern Thrace as being populated by Bulgarians, Greeks and Armenians, but makes no mention of Turks¹).

¹) Voyage en Orient, vol. 41, page 232, edited by A. Korell, 1878.

In spite of all methods employed by the Turkish government to strengthen the Turkish element in Eastern Thrace, it remained throughout inferior in numbers to the Bulgarian one. This becomes apparent from the following statistics concerning the ethnography of Eastern Thrace, which were published in 1876 in the Constantinople paper: "**Le Courrier d'Orient.**" These statistics are so much the more important, as they have been made in Turkey, under the very eye of the Turkish censor and at a time when the boundaries within which the Bulgarian race was living were being traced and when the question was being raised whether the vilayet of Adrianople could come within the lines of the Bulgarian-speaking population or whether it was to be left to Turkey.

		Houses	Mussulmans	Bulgarians	Greeks	Jews	Armenians	Divers
Sandjak of Adrianople.								
Caza of Adrianople	Nahieh of Yuskudar . . .	4,751	1,864	19,855	742	—	—	—
	" of Ada	1,822	1,555	2,646	3,727	—	—	—
	" of Tchoke	4,441	1,391	17,725	1,417	—	—	—
	" of Monastir	5,054	409	20,855	385	—	—	—
	town of Adrianople . . .	16,220	18,000	10,000	16,000	6,800	5,200	1,000
Caza of Kirk Kilisse		6,769	4,097	23,093	2,850	—	—	—
" " Tchirmen		9,056	2,218	9,633	1,626	—	—	—
" " Baba Eski		1,632	1,101	4,112	1,784	—	—	—
" " Bunar Hissar		3,317	1,359	10,202	3,416	—	—	—
" " Hafsa		1,776	1,792	4,661	1,708	—	—	—
" " Kizil Aghatch (Hatunelli) . . .		2,977	1,425	11,489	—	—	—	—
" " Uzun Keupru (Erghene)		4,355	6,522	8,870	6,777	—	—	—
" " Mustapha Pasha		3,739	1,450	15,708	—	—	—	—
" " Demotica		13,627	13,608	20,799	15,697	—	—	640
Sandjak of Tekirdag (Rodosto).								
Caza of Viza		3,513	—	10,487	5,884	—	—	—
" " Malgara		2,317	—	5,718	4,592	—	—	—
Sandjak of Gallipoli.								
Caza of Feredjik		3,076	—	12,585	2,174	—	—	—
" " Gumuldjina		2,740	—	9,062	3,645	—	—	—
Total nufuz		93,582	60,991	219,198	74,614	6,800	5,200	1,640

In the total of "Mussulmans" are comprised also the Albanians, the Tartars, the Circassians and the Gypsies. The statistics are incomplete as regards the sandjaks of Rodosto and Gallipoli, where the Turks are not mentioned for lack of exact data concerning them. However, they express in an exact manner the proportion between the Bulgarians and the Greeks.

These statistics are based on the so-called *nufuz*. These are a kind of official certificates of personal identity issued in Turkey to the male population from 16 to 60 years of age. In order to obtain the figures for the female population and for the male population unprovided with *nufuzes* statisticians multiply the number of *nufuzes* by 2 — 2 1/2. But, whatever method one employs, the *relation* between the *nufuzes* remains the same: the Bulgarian-speaking mass in the vilayet of Adrianople, from the river Mesta to the Constantinople peninsula, was in 1876 considerably bigger than that of the Turks and the Greeks taken together. Should we base our calculation for Eastern Thrace now under the Turks on the above ethnographical table, the result (as to the proportion existing between Bulgarians, Turks and Greeks) would come out about the same. It might be objected that these statistics embrace within the Bulgarian ethnographical boundaries *the Pomaks who are Mohammedans*. We must point out that the Pomaks speak the purest Bulgarian; they sing our national songs, they share our customs and superstitions, a great many among them even make the sign of the cross, although they observe the Mussulman prayers. The Pomaks are a branch of the Bulgarian people, they are flesh of our flesh, although they were forced to adopt the Mussulman religion in the past (17th century) as has been ascertained by all the scholars who have occupied themselves with this subject.

The Pomaks speak only the language of our forefathers and, in spite of the religious fanaticism with which the Turkish *hodjas* (religious teachers) have inspired them, these Bulgarians professing the Mohammedan religion have remained Bulgarian, just as the Mussulman Greeks of Crete have remained good Greeks, and as the Mussulman Servians of Bosnia and Herzegovina have remained good Servians. The Pomaks are not numerous in Turkish Thrace, because they inhabit in general the region of the Rhodopes, in Aegean Bulgaria, and do not play a particular part in the ethnography of Eastern Thrace.

After the liberation of Bulgaria, in 1878, the Turks went on with their policy of colonizing, their object being to thin down the Bulgarian population in the vilayet of Adrianople. The Turks-muhadjirs, artificially planted here, were given the lands belonging to the Bulgarian villages and our population saw itself forced to abandon its native hearths and flee to Bulgaria. Thus we find to-day in the districts of Varna, Baltchik, Provadia, Tutrakan, etc. about 100,000 emigrants from the vilayet of Adrianople. Long before these, other emigrants had fled in the direction of Burgas, Stara Zagora, Philippopolis, etc. It goes without saying that these Thracian Bulgarians quitted their homes and their native land because of cruel persecution.

When the revolutionary movement began in Macedonia and in Eastern Thrace the Turks used still more zealous efforts to drive out the Bulgarian element from Eastern Thrace. The year 1903 saw the most important insurrection that took place in Eastern Thrace, the Bulgarian population waged as many as forty battles against

a Turkish army of 30,000 sent out to suppress the insurrection. The facts about this insurrection may be learned from the reports of the ambassadors of the Great Powers in Constantinople.¹⁾ This insurrection was the cause of the ruin of many Bulgarian villages in Eastern Thrace.

Nevertheless, in spite of all the persecutions employed by the Turkish government, the ethnographical physiognomy of the old vilayet of Adrianople in 1899/900, that is to say, on the eve of the revolutionary movements, was the following: (The statistics which we give below are published by **Richard von Mach** in his work "Der Machtbereich des bulgarischen Exarchats in der Türkei, Leipzig und Neuchâtel, 1906." The division of the country in these statistics follows that of the dioceses):

Name of diocese	Number of the inhabited localities.	Bulgarian Exarchists	Bulgarian Patriarchists	Bulgarian Catholics	Greeks	Rumanians	Albanians	Gypsies
Xanthi	32	38,760	1,248	—	11,125	120	—	—
Maronia	33	17,280	2,008	—	8,190	30	—	—
Enos	37	21,664	1,728	—	10,990	—	—	—
Demotica	67	16,240	6,992	128	33,170	12	6,720	402
Adrianople	171	114,536	25,512	864	47,260	600	690	96
Lititsa (Ortakeui)	27	6,040	3,600	640	9,375	—	—	—
Heraclea	62	14,696	10,720	1,056	22,805	42	6,390	—
Viza	22	—	4,800	—	21,000	120	—	—
Total . .	451	229,216	56,608	2,688	163,015	924	13,800	498

If to the Bulgarian Exarchists, the Bulgarian Patriarchists, and the Bulgarian Catholics, we also add the Bulgarian Mussulmans, that is to say, the Pomaks in the vilayet of Adrianople, who, according to the investigations of **Mr. St. Shishkoff**, number 120,000 inhabitants, we shall arrive at this result that the Bulgarian population is many times bigger than the Greek population in the eight dioceses of the vilayet of Adrianople.

During the summer of 1913, after the Turco-Bulgarian war and the reoccupation of Eastern Thrace by the Turks, they massacred the population of the big Bulgarian town Bulgarkeui (district of Keshan), mentioned by all travellers who have crossed the country, and they expelled in the most brutal manner almost the entire Bulgarian population of the province of Adrianople, forcing it to take the road to Bulgaria.

¹⁾ See the report of *M. Constans*, French Ambassador in Constantinople, addressed to *M. Delcassé*, 22 August 1903.

To-day, this population, numbering over forty thousand families, that is to say — about 200,000 persons, is wandering hither and thither, deprived of its belongings and subject to misery, while its property movable and immovable — the fruit of its incessant labours — remains in the hands of the Turkish muhadjirs. And to this day it is not permitted to return to its native land. The Turks bring forward as a ground for opposing the repatriation of the Bulgarians of Eastern Thrace the false pretext that there existed between the Bulgarian and the Turkish governments an agreement by virtue of which the Bulgarian government had accepted the exchange of their property for that of the Turks in Bulgaria.

Even if we admit that this convention contains what the Turks claim, we have the right to ask first and foremost, who has obtained the consent of these Bulgarians of Eastern Thrace to their expulsion from their native firesides. Are they to blame, if they have been made the unhappy object of a still more unhappy barter? Are we not living in an era when the people themselves determine their destinies?

The Constantinople Convention between Bulgaria and Turkey, 29 September 1913, after the unfortunate Treaty of Bucharest, was nothing but an extortion with respect to the Bulgarian State. But even in this treaty it is stipulated (article 9) that "the Bulgarians, Turkish subjects, will not be disturbed in any manner in the possession of their property (movable and immovable) or in the exercise of their human rights. Those who, as a result of latter events, had quitted their homes could return to them in the space of two years."

Article 18 of this treaty says that several protocols are appended to it and form inseparable parts of it. The first of these protocols refers to the boundary. Point C. of same says: "The two governments agree to facilitate the voluntary exchange of the Bulgarian and Turkish populations as well as of their properties within a zone of fifteen kilometers along the whole of the common frontier. The exchange will take place under the auspices of both governments and with the participation of the elders of the villages concerned in the exchange. Mixed commissions, appointed by the two governments, will proceed with the exchange and the indemnification, if any differences result from the exchange of goods between the villages and private persons concerned."

It is evident that this convention is an act of violence; from the fact that there are very few Turkish villages within the fifteen kilometer zone along the larger part of the frontier. In any case there can be no comparison between the number of these villages and that of the Bulgarian villages within the Turkish zone whose inhabitants were expelled by the Turks. Then, the Turks expelled the Bulgarian population not only from the stipulated zone of fifteen kilometers but *from the entire province* — down to Constantinople. Aside from that, they allowed to none of the brutally expelled Bulgarians to return to their homes in Thrace or dispose of their property, although the convention gave them the right to a

delay of two years, and to an indemnity. In a word, the Turks did not respect even a convention which was directed against us, and at bottom had something of the nature of political extortion.

But, apart from that, whatever the nature of the convention might be, the fact remains that neither the Bulgarian nor the Turkish government consulted the unfortunate population when making that convention.

After 1915, when Bulgaria sided with the Central Powers, she did not dare to raise the political question about Eastern Thrace or about the indemnity due to the ruined Thracian Bulgarians, from fear of offending the Germans who considered the province of Adrianople as a rich hinterland to the Germanized Constantinople.

Our committee, in several confidential reports addressed to the Prime Minister *Mr. Radoslavoff*, protested repeatedly against the policy of the government of that time which sacrificed this precious portion of our common patrimony.

There do not exist exact figures as to the Bulgarian-speaking population in the vilayet of Adrianople in 1912, before the general expulsion of the Bulgarians of Thrace; but, taking into consideration the number of those expelled after the year 1900, the Bulgarian population in Eastern Thrace, on the eve of the Balkan war, could not have been under 400,000 in any case. A part of this population, probably one half of it, came within the boundaries of Aegean Bulgaria and we may assume that the number of those expelled from Eastern Thrace from 1878 until after the war of 1913 exceeds 300,000.

It is, therefore, this population which now appeals to the principles of President Wilson and demands the restoration of its rights, as it is inadmissible that so flagrant and so recent a violence, as was practised against our nation by the Turkish government, should create an ethnic claim in favour of the oppressor.

II.

However, as it is the Greeks, rather than the Turks, who to-day most insistently claim the possession of Eastern Thrace, we believe that it would not be useless to cite here, in addition to the statistics and exact data which we have given so far, several testimonies of European scholars and travellers — French, Russian, English, American, Swiss, Austrian and German — which prove in an irrefutable manner that Eastern Thrace is preeminently a Bulgarian and not a Greek province.

1. — **Guillaume de Tyr** gives us one of the most ancient testimonies about our country. . . . "Already in the XII century, at the time of the Byzantine domination, Guillaume de Tyr wrote: 'The Bulgarian nation occupies the whole space going from the Danube to the Adriatic Sea and to *Constantinople*. All that country, ten days' march wide and thirty days' march long, is called *Bulgaria*.'" (Emile de Laveleye: *La Péninsule des Balkans*, vol. II, 1886, p. 205.)

2. — In an article entitled: **Nachricht über die Volksmenge der Griechen in Rumlj oder Rumelien** and published in 1778, in the periodical "Magazin zur näheren Kenntniss des physischen und politischen Zustandes von Europa," herausg. v. Friedrich Leopold Brunn, I. Bd. Berlin, pp. 68—74, speaking of the Greek episcopal seats, *the region of Viza and Midia to the Black Sea is placed in the zone of Bulgarian lands.*

We introduce two English testimonies from the beginning of the 19th century.

3. — **William Martin-Leake:** *Researches in Greece*, London, 1814. "The Christians speaking the Bulgarian dialect inhabit . . . (among other lands) the entire Moesia and the interior of Thrace to the Danube and to the very outskirts of Constantinople." (p. 375.)

4. — **David Urquhart:** *Turkey and its Resources*, London, 1833.

The author was secretary of the British embassy in Constantinople. In 1831 he made a journey in the interior of European Turkey. His book was dedicated to the king of England.

"The Bulgarians... who have remained true to their religion inhabit the plains of Macedonia . . ., of Bulgaria and of Thrace, the environs of Monastir, Salonica . . . Adrianople and even Constantinople. They (the Bulgarians) constitute therefore the great majority of the population and are exposed to an incessant and systematic oppression."

5. — **Eneholm:** Notes on the towns situated on the other side of the Balkans, occupied by the Russian army during the glorious campaign of 1829, by Colonel Eneholm of the Russian General Staff, St. Petersburg, 1830. (In French.)

In these notes, it is said with regard to the district of Lozengrad (Kirk Kilisse): "There are 28 villages under Kirk Kilisse, which count 1,260 Bulgarian 470 Turkish, 20 Gipsy houses, — in all 1750." (page 92.) Then on page 97: "In the town of Viza one finds... 150 Turkish, 560 Greek and Bulgarian, 5 Gipsy houses, — in all 715 houses. Under this town are 27 villages, of which 9 are populated by Bulgarians, 15 by Turks and 3 by Mussulmans and Christians, containing 1250 Bulgarian and 380 Turkish houses." On page 100: "There are 9 villages under this town (Midia) of which 8 are Christian and 1 Turkish, containing in all 1090 Greek and Bulgarian and 60 Turkish houses, with a population of about 6,000." On page 101: "In the Bulgarian villages, 800 houses are free from every tax, these families are only obliged to work in the mines of Samokovo. Samokovo numbers 472 Bulgarian and 13 Greek houses."

From the passages just quoted it becomes clear that *the rural population of the entire country*, at the commencement of the 19th century, was for the most part of Bulgarian nationality.

6. — F. P. Fonton: Letters, humoristic, political and military, from the headquarters of the army of the Danube in 1828 and 1829. Leipsic, 1862. (The author is a Russian.)

A letter dated Eski Sarai, Adrianople, and inserted on p. 108 contains these lines: "With regard to the population, the Mussulmans are not very numerous and are in the villages. As for the Christian population, which forms the majority, it is composed of Greeks, clever and active, who inhabit the sea-coast, whereas inland we see *the Bulgarian population forming a compact mass, healthy and fresh*, animated with the hope of freeing itself from the hateful yoke."

7. — I. P. Liprandi: The Eastern Question and Bulgaria, Moscow, 1868. Russian publication.

In the middle of the 19th century, I. P. Liprandi wrote (page 11): "In the town of Viza and its neighbourhood *two thirds of the population is Bulgarian*. In Adrianople, out of a total of 111,000 inhabitants, 25,000 are Bulgarians and about 45,000 Turks; the remainder is composed of Greeks, Armenians, Jews and Gypsies. In Kirk Kilisse, a town of about 8,000 inhabitants — the greater part of them are Bulgarians. To the east of Kirk Kilisse towards the Black Sea, then over in Tirnovo, Samokovo and surroundings — almost all are Bulgarians. In Midia the Bulgarians constitute a quarter of the population; in the vicinity there is nothing but Bulgarians. In Achtopol and in Vasiliko all are Bulgarians. In Silivria the Bulgarians are no fewer. *In Tchortlu the Bulgarians predominate*. In short, there are Bulgarians even as far as Constantinople. In Indjik, a small manufacturing town, the bulk of the population is Bulgarian. In the region of Demotica many Bulgarian villages extend to Enos and thence, eastwards, to the sea-coast."

He gives the following frontiers for Bulgaria: . . . "To the East — the Black Sea, from the mouth of the Danube *down to the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmora, the Dardanelles and the Aegean Sea*."

"In Rodosto, out of 40,000 inhabitants, 8,000 are Bulgarians. There are as many in Gallipoli while in Karakeui and in Russkeui or Kazan there is nothing but Bulgarians. In Bunar Hissar five sixths of the population are Bulgarians. It is evident that the Bulgarian population is on the increase, while the Turkish and the Greek population is diminishing."

8. — Here is the testimony of **Cyprien Robert**, the well-known professor of Slavic literature at the university of Paris, who made a personal study of divers ethnographical questions concerning the Balkan peninsula in the first half of the 19th century:

Cyprien Robert: Les Slaves de Turquie, volume II, 1844, page 230: "Neglecting to ascertain the movement and displacement of races, the geographers still assign as limits to Bulgaria Thrace, Macedonia and Albania, three provinces in

which to-day the Bulgarian race is abounding . . . In Thrace the Bulgarians also hold important positions and *form the basis of the population as near Constantinople as Indjik, a small industrial town.*"

Page 250: "Six miles farther, the small port of Silivria, with a purely Bulgarian population of about four thousand souls. Thus, a few miles only from Stambul, the sweet and rich Slav idiom begins to strike the ear."

We also cite here two French and one English author of the same period:

9. — Dr. C. T. Poyet: "La Bulgarie dans le présent et l'avenir," Paris, 1860.

"Bulgaria is no longer that country bounded on one side by the Danube and on the other by the Balkan mountain. Bulgaria is also Thrace, Macedonia, in a word — *four fifths of Roumelia*, where dwells a people having their own particular language, their own manners and who are energetically opposed to being joined to another people."

10. — Auguste Dozon: Chansons populaires bulgares, Paris, 1875.

"This language (the Bulgarian language) dominates to-day, not only in Bulgaria, but also *in the larger part* (p. XII) *of Thrace and of Macedonia.*"

A. Dozon, a French consul and a literary man, knew the Bulgarian language and studied the Bulgarian songs on commission from the Institute of France.

11. — William Denton: The Christians of Turkey, 1867.

"The Bulgarian people . . . do not occupy only the province known under the name of Bulgaria, but *form a large portion of the population of Thrace, of Macedonia, etc.*"

This Anglican pastor travelled in European Turkey in 1862 and 1863.

12. — Wilhelm Pressel, an engineer, who in 1860—1870 laid out the railway lines in Turkey, and who had the chance and the means to study on the spot the relations between the various nationalities, says the same thing in his article: "Land und Leute in der europäischen Türkei," in the review "Das Ausland," Wochenschrift für Länder-und Völkerkunde, 58 Jahrgang, 1885, Stuttgart and München.

Examining the boundaries of the Bulgarian nationality about 1860, he extends their southern and south-eastern limits to the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmora and makes them follow the coast of the Aegean Sea to the mouth of the Vardar River. *South-east, namely, says he, the Bulgarians reach the outskirts of Constantinople and the town of Enos. "In certain parts of the coast, as for example Silivria, Rodosto, etc., the Bulgarians constitute the majority of the population."*

13. — Paul Dehn maintains the same thing in his book: "Deutschland nach Osten. I. Land und Leute der Balkanhalbinsel," München und Leipzig, 1886, saying (page 9):

"To-day (1886) the Bulgarians form *the larger portion of the population* not only in Bulgaria and in Eastern Roumelia, but also in the immediately adjoining province of European Turkey, with the exception of Albania." He too believes that south-east and south the boundaries of the Bulgarian nation extend to the coast of the Black Sea, *the Sea of Marmora and the Aegean Sea*. He also mentions *Silivria, Rodosto, Enos, etc.*

See also: "Die Völker Südeuropas." Halle a/S. 1909, page 21, of the same author.

14. — Here is the opinion of an Austrian, **Karl Sax**, who was vice-consul of Austria-Hungary at Adrianople: "Geographisch-ethnographische Skizze von Bulgarien (Mitteilungen der Kaiserlich-Königlichen geographischen Gesellschaft, Bd. XII, Neue Folge, 2 Band)," Wien 1869, pages 449—482.

On page 459 **Karl Sax** acknowledges that "*the Bulgarians constitute almost two thirds of the Adrianople vilayet.*" In tracing the ethnographical boundaries of the Bulgarian nation, he writes on the same page: "*On the south-east the Bulgarians extend (from the Aegean Sea) to the Constantinople peninsula.*"

15. — **Amand Freiherr von Schweiger-Lerchenfeld**: Unter dem Halbmonde. Ein Bild des ottomanischen Reiches und seiner Völker, Jena, 1876.

This author says (page 32): Among other lands the Bulgarians "*people the larger part of Macedonia and a considerable stretch in Thrace.*" "*At all events, they are comparatively the strongest people numerically in European Turkey.*"

16. — Very interesting are the results at which **V. Teploff** has arrived. He has studied on the spot the racial relations in the Bulgarian lands:

V. Teploff: Adrianople, 1874. Russian work.

(Page 40):... "*In spite of the preponderating majority of the Bulgarian population in this province (Eastern Thrace), the Greeks endeavour by all possible means to bring the bulk of its inhabitants under the spiritual power of the patriarchate of Constantinople by giving them the name of Greeks and in this way to justify their claims to a country which is now completely Slavic.*"

17. — **V. Teploff**: Materials for the Statistics of Bulgaria, Thrace and Macedonia, St. Petersburg. 1877, Russian work.

(Page 21) . . . "We find Greeks as agriculturists beyond Makri, on the Maritsa and in general in Eastern Thrace, but there also *the Greek population*, as is corroborated by all the consular reports, *is insignificant and completely disappears in the compact mass of the Bulgarian element which surrounds it.*"

The fact that the Greeks live only in the towns, while the compact mass of peasants is of Bulgarian nationality, is attested by numerous authors. Here are several of them:

18. — Albert Dumont: *Le Balkan et l'Adriatique*, Paris, 1873.

(Page 119). . . "*Although the province of Adrianople is a Bulgarian country, the population of the town of Adrianople is mostly Ottoman and Greek. . .*"

19. — Franz Crousse, Major of the General Staff, confirms that the Greeks live mostly in the towns, where they could be found in compact masses.

Franz Crousse: *La Péninsule gréco-slave*, Bruxelles, 1876.

(Page 169) "In Thrace and in Macedonia the Greeks are quite scattered except in several towns: Constantinople, Adrianople. . ."

Here is the very valuable opinion of two English authors:

20. — Ravenstein F. G.: *The Populations of Russia and Turkey* (Journal of the Statistical Society of London. London, vol. 440, 1877).

(Page 449). "Note . . . Bulgaria includes the sandjaks of Adrianople, Philippopolis, Sofia . . . in all of which *the Bulgarians predominate.*"

In Table II (inserted on page 450—451) he gives the following statistical information about the sandjak of Adrianople: "Population 357,000, of which Mohammedans 114,000; the *preponderating nationality being the Bulgarians* with 162,000."

21. — J. Baker, (Lieutenant-Colonel of the Auxiliary Forces): *Turkey in Europe*, Third Edition, London, Paris, New-York. 1877.

The passages which we cite are from the German translation of the book.

James Baker, *Die Türken in Europa, mit einer Einleitung: "Die Orientalische Frage als Culturfrage,"* von Hermann Vámbéry und historisch-ethnographischen Anmerkungen von Karl Emil Franzos, Stuttgart, 1878.

(Page 16) "*The Bulgarians constitute to-day the larger part of the population in European Turkey, with the exception of Albania and the tributary provinces.*"

(Page 44) In the same book Baker expresses the following conclusion: "We have made it clear already that the Bulgarians constitute *the larger part of the population* from the frontier of Macedonia to the Black Sea *and from the Danube to the Sea of Marmora.*"

At the time of the creation of the Bulgaria of San Stefano, we find, a little before, and just after, the Congress of Berlin the two following Russian testimonies:

22. — In the ethnographic map of the Slav nations (1867) by the Russian ethnographer **M. F. Mirkovitch**, the Bulgarian territory includes among other things *Adrianople down to Tchorlu and Dercos, and reaches the Black Sea.*

23. — Count N. P. Ignatieff: *Memoirs*, Historical Journal, Vol. 136, Petrograd, 1914. (In Russian.)

On page 66 he says: "Really, *two thirds of Macedonia and of Thrace are inhabited by Bulgarians.*" (p. 66). "With regard to the views exchanged in Berlin among the three ministers of foreign affairs (Bismarck, Prince Gortchakoff and Count Andrassy), I said that, having created (1878) an autonomous Bulgaria, we cannot leave outside her frontiers the portions of *Thrace and Macedonia which are inhabited by Bulgarians.*"

24. — Heinrich Kiepert: Die neuen Territorialgrenzen auf der Balkanhalbinsel vom Gesichtspunkte der Nationalgrenzen, "Globus," Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder-und Völkerkunde. Braunschweig, 1878, 33 Bd.

"The impartial researches of German and Western observers," says this author, "leave no doubt that *the rural population and the majority of the urban population in the interior of Macedonia and of Thrace, to the very gates of the Turkish capital, speak the Bulgarian language* and that only the educated part of this population understands the Greek language. The Bulgarian element covers even a larger part than is shown on my map (Eastern Thrace is meant), a fact to which I have drawn attention in the text of the second edition of this map." (p. 268).

Kiepert corrects farther on in his work an inaccuracy in the frontier established by the treaty of San Stefano, which left out of the true boundaries of our race the agglomerations of Pomaks in the Rhodope mountains and in the Akhi Tchelebi region. He says: "According to the results of the most recent researches here also *the great mass is Bulgarian* and the majority among them has been forced by violence to adopt Islamism."

25. — Here is the opinion of **Bismarck** expressed on the occasion of an interpellation in the Reichstag, as we find it in Emile de Laveleye's work: *La Péninsule des Balkans*, 1886, Vol. II.

(P. 205.) In his speech delivered on 19 February 1878, in reply to an interpellation addressed to him by M. de Bennigsen relative to the Eastern Question, Bismarck declared: "The ethnographical situation of Bulgaria, as I know it from authentic sources and as it follows *from the best map which we know of, that of Kiepert*, is such that her national boundaries extend to the west, almost without any admixture, beyond Salonica and to the east, with a slight admixture of the Turkish element, to the Black Sea." According to this, Prince Bismarck considered *the territory between Salonica and the Black Sea* a Bulgarian land, too.

26. — Here is what Captain **Léon Lamouche** says in his work: "Bulgaria, past and present," (*"La Bulgarie dans le passé et le présent,"* 1892, Paris), concerning the new edition of Kiepert's ethnographic map of the Bulgarian lands, corrected in our favour.

Page 44: "According to Kiepert's map, the line would cross the Maritsa at Demotica and would then follow the left bank of this river down to the neighbourhood of the sea, passing then *north-east of Rodosto*, passing through Viza, and reaching the Black Sea coast . . . **Lejean** brings this boundary somewhat farther to the north but *that of Kiepert ought to be nearer the truth.*"

The same author, who was a member of the French commission for the Mürzsteg reforms, writes in his work regarding the boundaries of the Bulgaria of the San Stefano Treaty (page 110): "The treaty of peace signed in San Stefano, 3 March 1878 . . . corresponded fully with the hopes of the Bulgarians, in granting an almost complete independence to the whole of the European provinces of Turkey, *in which they formed the majority of the population.*"

. . . . "The principality extended from the Black Sea to the mountains of Albania and from the Danube to the Aegean Sea" "This delimitation was in conformity with the traditions of history and at the same time the data of ethnography." (p. 111).

27. — Léon Lamouche: La Péninsule Balkanique, Paris, 1899.

(Page 20) "The northern part of Thrace is peopled by a *majority of Bulgarians*, mixed with Greeks and Turks. One finds Bulgarian villages even in the immediate neighbourhood of the capital."

(Pages 25—26) „One ought therefore to add to the Bulgarian nationality the Macedonian Slavs, whose number may be estimated at a million, *making, together with the Bulgarians of the Adrianople vilayet, a million and a half.*"

28. — Here is how our ethnographic frontier to the south is drawn in a German article: "**Land und Leute in Bulgarien,**" Die Grenzboten, Zeitschrift für Politik, Literatur und Kunst, 45 Jahrgang, IV Quartal, Leipzig, 1886.

(Page 97) "From Serres it reaches Cavalla on the Aegean Sea, which it *leaves at the mouth of the Maritsa and thence going to Midia, on the Black Sea.*"

29. — In his new book "Le Panslavisme et l'intérêt français," Paris, 1917, the celebrated French authority on Slav questions, **M. Louis Léger**, professor at the Collège de France, speaking of our ethnographic rights, mentions expressly the "precise statements" of Kiepert's map and says of Kiepert that he is "*an independent ethnographer.*" (page 12).

30. — Ferdinand Lecomte, Colonel commanding a division, and a distinguished military writer: Guerre d'Orient en 1876—77, Lausanne, 1877—78, Vol. I.

On page 29 he says: "The Bulgarians occupy . . . the right bank of the Danube, from its mouth to its confluence with the river Timok, both slopes of the Balkan chain, *the greater part of the Thracian plains . . . etc.*"

31. — Ernest Dottain (former professor of history): *La Turquie d'Europe* d'après le traité de Berlin, Paris, 1878.

"They (the Bulgarians) occupy not only Bulgaria proper, north of the Balkans, but also *the greater part of Thrace etc.*"

32. — Prof. Lubor Niederlé, one of the most eminent Slavists of our day, traces in the following way the ethnographic boundary of Bulgaria on the south-east: "From the Aegean Sea it passes through Uzun Keupru, Baba Eski, Tchorlu, Tchataldja and goes to the outskirts of Constantinople."

(Page 200). "At the end of 1900 the total number of Bulgarians should be distributed as follows: Turkish Roumelia, Albania, Constantinople, Asia-Minor 600,000."

It is mainly the province of Adrianople that Niederle has in mind, as the Bulgarian population in Albania, Constantinople, and Asia Minor is very small.

(Page 201). "In Turkish Roumelia, I count the Pomaks among the Bulgarians. For the vilayet of Adrianople Mach estimates the number of the Orthodox Bulgarians at 370,000 and of the Mussulman Bulgarians at 115,000." ("La Race Slave." Translated from the Czech by **Louis Léger** of the Institute, Paris, 1911).

33. — The well-known Slavist **T. D. Florinski** finds, in his book: "The Slav Race, statistical and ethnographic survey on the contemporary Slav race," Kiev, 1907 (Russian work), that, at the end of 1906, the Bulgarians of Turkish Roumelia, Constantinople and other parts of European Turkey (Macedonia excepted) numbered 661,200 souls (page 71).

34. — Herder's Konversations-Lexikon. Freiburg in Br. 1903.

It is written on page 330, vol. II, "In Thrace and in Macedonia (European Turkey) there are 1,700,000 Bulgarians." The Pomaks (in Bulgaria and in Turkey) number 250,000.

35. — Brockhaus' Konversations-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1908.

It written on page 677, vol III: "The Bulgarian populations occupy to-day the whole of Moesia, Thrace and Macedonia. The Bulgarian population extends to *Constantinople*." The Pomaks are about 300,000 and inhabit chiefly the Rhodope province.

36. — As regards more especially the Pomaks, here is what a more recent French writer says of them:

Fresneaux: *L'Orient, Les Osmanlys, Chrétiens des Balkans*, Paris 1892.

"All this territory, comprised between the Hebrus and the Strymon of the ancients — adjacent to Thrace and Macedonia — *is inhabited mainly by Bulgarians*

and by Pomaks. The Pomaks are Bulgarians converted to Islamism; they speak Bulgarian and have preserved all their national customs. The villages are entirely Bulgarian, in the maritime towns and around them one finds Greeks. *Ethnically and politically, the whole of this country (between the Maritsa and the Struma) belongs by right to the Bulgarians.*" (p. 262).

37. — The distinguished student of our history **Guérin Songeon** (Rev. Father of the Augustines of the Assumption), speaks thus of the number of Bulgarians in Macedonia and in Thrace ("Histoire de la Bulgarie," Paris 1913):

(Page 19) . . . "In the vilayet of *Adrianople* and in Macedonia there are 1,800,000 Bulgarians."

Finally, here is an important and very recent American testimony:

38. — **Leon Dominian**: The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe, 1917. Publication of the Geographical Society of New York.

"The valley of the Maritsa is essentially Bulgarian. Many Greek colonies on the coast, between the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus and on the Black Sea occupy themselves with fishing and sailing. The trade there is almost entirely in their hands. The Bulgarians occupy themselves uniquely with agriculture. Their farms extend to the very walls of Constantinople."

39. — **The American Missionaries** began their work among the Bulgarians of Thrace in 1858 when the first missionary was stationed at Adrianople. The Missionary Herald, 1858, Vol. LIV, № 10, p. 322, prints a survey of European Turkey as a field of Christian Missions, in which it is admitted that *the Bulgarians inhabit* "not only what is usually called Bulgaria proper, extending from the Danube to the Balkan mountains, but also a widely extended region south of these mountains, reaching to the Bosphorus and the Marmora, and the Aegean Sea, and embracing a good part of ancient Thrace, Albania and Macedonia."

40. — The American Missionary **Mr. Crane**, writing from Adrianople in 1861, feels there the pulsing of the struggle which the Bulgarians had begun against the Greek patriarchate. In this connection he writes: "The struggle of the Bulgarians against the Greeks has been one of thrilling interest. Five millions of people have been endeavoring to free themselves from the thralldom of the Greek hierarchy."

41. — That Adrianople about 1858 was the center of a Bulgarian province, is evident from the fact that **Mr. Charles F. Morse** composed there one of the first grammars of the modern Bulgarian. Cf. The Missionary Herald, Vol. LV, № 2, February, 1859.

42. — May we be allowed, before we close this series of foreign testimonies, to recall to mind a fact not generally known: About 1860 the governments of France and the Piedmont decided to send **Roman Catholic missions in the Balkans**, and instructed them to work among the strongest element ethnically. When the missionaries (Assumptionist, Augustine and Dominican) arrived, they informed the two governments that the most compact population in the peninsula was the Bulgarian population and that they selected as centers for their activity Philippopolis and *Adrianople*. This fact can be verified in the respective archives.

43. — From the circle of the Catholic missionaries who have worked long in our midst we shall cite here the testimony of **Paul Christoff**, a native of France, a man of high culture, who knew well Adrianople and the province of Adrianople, and who under a Bulgarian name published in 1912 a work in Paris (in the series *Nouvelle Bibliothèque pour tous*), on the life and activity of Panteleimon, one of the most prominent Bulgarians in the sphere of the spiritual life of our people, who was born in one of the Bulgarian villages around Adrianople. The book about Panteleimon gives a clear understanding of the character of the population which inhabits the province of Adrianople and which at the beginning of the 60 s began its struggle for liberation from the ecclesiastical yoke of the Greek patriarchate.

"Meanwhile," he writes, "the separatist movement which was to lead to the religious independence of the Bulgarians from Phanar and later to their political independence from the Sublime Porte, had made great progress since November, 1859, when it had broken out in Salonica.

"The whole of Bulgaria, *Thrace*, and a part of Macedonia were stirred by these events. *The Bulgarians of Adrianople and the surrounding villages* had also joined the national movement and had separated themselves from their age-long oppressors, the Greeks." (p. 71).

44. — Furthermore, a great many ethnographic maps speak equally in our favour. We do not wish to cite here but the map of the well-known scholar **A. F. Rittich**, published in his capital work, *The Slav World*, (Warsaw, 1885); the ethnographic map of the Slav Benevolent Society of St. Petersburg (1890), and the two most recent ones: that of the **Agostini** Ethnographic and Linguistic Institute at Novara, Italy, 1917) and that of the Lithuanian **Jean Gabrys**, Secretary of the Union of Nationalities at Lausanne (1918).

All these documents require no commentary, because they outline the facts sufficiently well and speak for themselves.

We find most recent American information on the ethnographic relations in the extreme south-eastern part of the Balkan Peninsula in the following publications:

45. — **A League of Nations**, December, 1917, Vol. I, № 2, published by the World Peace Foundation, Boston, where a man of science whom we have already quoted, Mr. Leon Dominian, accompanies an article on the Nationality Map of Europe by an ethnographic map according to which the *Bulgarian nationality extends bodily beyond the Enos-Midia line*.

46. — **Prof. Stephen P. Duggan**, of the College of the City of New York, an American scholar, who is regarded in America as an expert on the Balkans, prints in *Asia*, Journal of the American Asiatic Association, Vol. XVIII, Number 12, a special article on a "Just Balkan Settlement," to which is appended an ethnographic map of the Balkans and Austria-Hungary (p. 997.) In this map the *Bulgarians inhabit the regions far to the south-east of Adrianople and Midia*.

47. — In the same issue of the *Asia* appears an article by **H. Charles Woods**, Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, entitled "Rearranging the Near East." On p. 1047 the author expresses the following opinion. "The southeastern boundary of Bulgaria should be formed by the Enos-Midia Line, arranged by the Treaty of London of May, 1913, and recognized by the Great Powers at that time."

In this series of testimonies there are some from German and Austrian travelers and scholars which we have inserted in order to present a complete picture. Their testimony in favour of our cause is of great importance because the Germans maintained in general an attitude hostile to us until 1913, when they succeeded in gaining the Bulgarian government's support for their policy.

In conclusion, we take the liberty to repeat that the Bulgarian population which has been driven away from Eastern Thrace has remained until now in the most complete misery. It yearns for its native firesides and hopes that the Conference of Peace, which is sitting now in Paris and which has proclaimed the right for every nation to decide its own fate, will not allow itself to be led astray by the Greek delegates. In 1912, when the fate of Eastern Thrace was being decided in London, Mr. Venizelos tacitly recognized the Bulgarian aspect of this province and did not lay claim either to the now Turkish or to the now Bulgarian part of the old vilayet of Adrianople. He did not attempt to dispute seriously our right to possess this vilayet even at Bucharest, where Bulgaria was at the mercy of her allies who did not scruple to appropriate to themselves Bulgarian lands.

The exiles from Eastern Thrace are profoundly convinced that the Peace Conference will take to heart their national rights and interests and will give satisfaction to their fervent wish to see the land of their fathers and forefathers united to their mother-country, for whom they have suffered so long and for whom they

were so cruelly sacrificed in 1913, bringing to ruin the very province where, at the cost of streams of Bulgarian blood, Turkish power in Europe was destroyed.

To-day, when the respect of international treaties is considered a national virtue and a principle of state, the refugees hope that the Entente powers and the United States of America will call to mind the London Protocol of May, 1913 and will re-establish the validity of this historical document, which was brutally trampled under foot by the Turks, before the ink with which it had been written had had the time to dry.

The High Committee for Eastern Thrace,

representing the Associations of Refugees from the province of Adrianople.

